

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,345	06/28/2001	Krishnamurthy Soumyanath	42390.P11206	8325
7590 11/17/2004 EXAMINER				INER
Seth Z. Kalson			NGUYEN, HAI L	

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2816

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	·	
		09/896,345	SOUMYANATH E	SOUMYANATH ET AL.	
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Hai L. Nguyen	2816	Au Au	
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ac	idress	
A SH THE - Exte after - If th - If NO - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. In sicins of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 ISIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply I period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the property will, by statute I reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing I period patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a y within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rly (30) days will be considered timel NTHS from the mailing date of this c BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. communication.	
Status					
	, 	s action is non-final. nce except for formal mat		e merits is	
Dienoeit	ion of Claims	•	·		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 3.4.6.9.10.12.22 and 23 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 3.4.6.9.10.12.22 and 23 is/are rejected Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 September 2001</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[drawing(s) be held in abeya ion is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 Cl	FR 1.121(d).	
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority document: Certified copies of the priority document: Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in A rity documents have beer u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National	Stage	
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Infor	t(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTC 	O-152)	

Response to Amendment

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's appeal brief filed on 8/24/2004 has been received and entered in the case.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art rejections mailed on 02/20/2004 have been fully considered and found persuasive, as such; the prior art rejections have been withdrawn. A new action on the merits appears below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 22, and 23 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers (US Pat. 5,561,383; previously cited) in view of Asakawa et al. (US Pat. 4,258,310), and further in view of Mehrotra et al. (US Pat. 6,686,300).

With regard to claims 3 and 4, Rogers discloses in Fig. 1b an averaging circuit, and a method of use thereof, comprising an input port (the left one) having an input signal voltage; an output port (the right one) having an output voltage; wherein the output voltage is indicative of a local time-average maximum of the input signal voltage. The reference circuit meets all the claimed limitations except for the element between the input port and the output port is a resistor instead of a field-effect-transistor (502 in instant Fig. 5). Asakawa et al. teaches in Fig. 4c that resistor and field-effect-transistor having gate and source connected together as recited in the

claim, are functionally equivalent. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to replace the resistor in the averaging circuit of Rogers by the field-effect-transistor in order to reduce the size of the circuit because the field-effect-transistor can be fabricated on the chip. Furthermore, Mehrotra et al. teaches in Fig.1 that an increase in leakage current with decreasing gate width is increasing drive current (see column 1, lines 48-60). In other words, the field-effect-transistor has a higher leakage current in term of higher ampere per micron of device width and typically in excess of 1 microampere per micron of device width will have the advantage of increasing drive current. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to increase the leakage current of the field-effect-transistor in the averaging circuit in order to provide stronger drive current for subsequent circuits. Thus, the limitation "wherein the FET has a leakage current in excess of 1 micro ampere per micron of device width" is also met by the references.

With regard to claim 22, the averaging circuit further comprises an output circuit (the capacitor in Fig. 1b of Rogers).

Claims 9, 10, and 23 are similarly rejected; note the above discussion with regard to claims 3, 4, and 22. Since, it is well known in the art for circuit designers to reverse the direction of the field-effect-transistor mentioned above in order to reverse the polarity of the output (see Figs. 1C, 1D, 8C, 8D of Kogan; US Patent 5,321,656; previously cited).

4. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA), Fig. 4 in the present application, in view of Pathak (US Pat. 5,828,603), and further in view of Mehrotra et al.

Art Unit: 2816

The APA in Fig. 4 shows a circuit to provide direct current (DC) offset correction to an input signal voltage, the circuit comprising an input port (IN in instant Fig. 4) having the input signal voltage; a field-effect-transistor (402); and a DC offset correction unit (406) responsive to the DC offset correction voltage to subtract the DC offset correction voltage from the input signal voltage. Fig. 4 of the prior art meets all the claimed limitations, except that the fieldeffect-transistor is not configured as recited in the claim. Pathak teaches in Fig. 1 that fieldeffect-transistor, having gate connected to bias voltage, and a field-effect-transistor, having gate and source connected together as recited in the claim, are functionally equivalent. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement the field-effect-transistor in the circuit of APA by using the field-effect-transistor having the gate and source connected together taught by Pathak in order to provide the DC offset correction voltage as a local time-average maximum/minimum of the input signal voltage. Furthermore, the limitation "wherein the FET has a leakage current in excess of 1 micro ampere per micron of device width" is also met by the references; note the above discussion with regard to claims 3 and 4.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai L. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1747 and Right Fax number is 571-273-1747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 09/896,345

Art Unit: 2816

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Callahan can be reached on 571-272-1740. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1562.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).